

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857) msobol@lchb.com Roger N. Heller (State Bar No. 215348) rheller@lchb.com LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNST 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: 415.956.1000 Facsimile: 415.956.1008 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Clar Roberts (additional counsel listed on signature page)		
8	(r r r r		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11			
12	MARCUS A. ROBERTS, KENNETH A.	Case No. 3:15-cv-03418-EMC	
13	CHEWEY, ASHLEY M. CHEWEY, and JAMES KRENN, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE	
14		MOTION FOR JOINT STATUS CONFERENCE IN THE <i>ROBERTS</i> AND	
15	Plaintiffs,	FTC ACTIONS	
16	v.	The Honorable Edward M. Chen	
17	AT&T MOBILITY LLC,		
18	Defendant.		
19			
20	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,	Case No. 3:14-cv-04785-EMC	
21	Plaintiff,		
22	v.		
23	AT&T MOBILITY LLC, a limited liability company,		
24	Defendant.		
25			
26			
27			
28			

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
l	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
L	5
1	6
1	
1	
1	
	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
	_

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 16-10(c), Plaintiffs in the above-captioned *Roberts* case respectfully request that the Court set a joint status conference for the earliest practicable date in *Roberts* and in the related case pending before this Court, *FTC v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, No. 3:14-cv-4785-EMC (N.D. Cal.) (the "FTC Action"). (*Roberts* and the FTC Action have been formally related; *see* Dkt. 7.) The *Roberts* Plaintiffs respectfully submit that a status conference is necessary to help protect the interests of Plaintiffs and the putative class members in *Roberts*.

As the Court is aware, the *Roberts* action and the FTC Action both challenge alleged false and deceptive advertising and unfair practices by AT&T regarding its "unlimited" mobile data plans. The most recent status conference in *Roberts* was held on August 22, 2019. (Dkt. 143) On August 23, 2019, AT&T and the FTC notified the Court that: they had finalized the terms of a settlement agreement in the FTC Action which includes "consumer redress" (hereinafter, the "FTC Agreement"); AT&T had signed the FTC Agreement; and the FTC Agreement would be presented to the FTC commissioners for approval. (FTC Action, Dkt. 182). It is the *Roberts* Plaintiffs' understanding that, as of the present filing, the Commission has not yet formally approved the FTC Agreement, but that if and when they do so, AT&T and the FTC plan to file the FTC Agreement with the Court and request that the Court promptly enter an order effectuating same.

Counsel for the *Roberts* Plaintiffs have reached out to counsel for AT&T and the FTC, requesting the terms of the FTC Agreement and asking whether the FTC Agreement purports to adjudicate or release any claims of plaintiffs or the putative class members in *Roberts*. The FTC stated that it was not at liberty to share the agreement with any third party before it is public. AT&T, for its part, would not agree to share the agreement pursuant to a confidentiality (i.e., non-disclosure) agreement where *Roberts* counsel would reserve the ability to bring the information to the Court's attention (under seal) if they believed it was necessary to do so to protect the putative class's interests.

While they have not seen the agreement or its terms, the undersigned have been informed

- 1 -

²⁷²⁸

¹ A few weeks prior, AT&T and the FTC had informed the Court they had reached an agreement in principle on certain settlement terms. FTC Action Dkt. 179.

Case 3:14-cv-04785-EMC Document 184 Filed 10/13/19 Page 3 of 4

affect the interests of Plaintiffs and the putative class members in Roberts. AT&T has suggeste		
that any concerns regarding these issues should be raised in Roberts after the FTC Agreement has		
been entered as an order in the FTC Action. However, by that time it may be too late to avoid or		
fully avoid undue prejudice to the putative class members.		

To be clear, the *Roberts* Plaintiffs do not know the terms of the FTC Agreement. They do not know, for example, how much monetary relief will be provided to consumers under the agreement, how that money will be distributed, or whether the agreement purports to require consumers to release their private claims (e.g., by virtue of cashing a check) without adequate notice and/or due process. The *Roberts* Plaintiffs are filing this motion requesting a joint status conference, proactively and without prejudging the agreement, in order to ensure that they have an opportunity to review and weigh in regarding the FTC Agreement *before* the FTC Agreement is entered as an order in the FTC Action. That is critical because neither the FTC nor AT&T represents the interests of Plaintiffs or the putative class members in *Roberts*.

The *Roberts* Plaintiffs' interests here are sufficient to support formal intervention in the FTC Action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24, however the *Roberts* Plaintiffs submit that the most efficient mechanism to address these issues, for the parties and the Court, would be a joint status conference. Accordingly, the *Roberts* Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court set a joint status conference in *Roberts* and the FTC Action for the soonest practicable date to address the foregoing. A proposed order is being filed herewith.

The *Roberts* Plaintiffs asked AT&T and the FTC to consent to this request for a status conference. Both AT&T and the FTC responded that they would not consent. *See* Heller Decl.., ¶ 2.

1	Dated: October 13, 2019	Respectfully submitted,
2		LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
3		By: /s/ Roger N. Heller Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857)
4		Roger N. Heller (State Bar No. 215348) 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
5 6		San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: 415.956.1000 Facsimile: 415.956.1008
7		Alexander H. Schmidt, Esq.
8		Fairways Professional Plaza 5 Professional Circle
9		Colts Neck, New Jersey 07722 Telephone: (732) 226-0004
10		D. Anthony Mastando Eric J. Artrip
11		MASTANDO & ARTRIP, LLC 301 Washington St., Suite 302
12		Huntsville, AL 35801 Telephone: (256) 532-2222
13		Daniel M. Hattis (SBN 232141)
14		HATTIS LAW Post Office Box 1645
15		Bellevue, Washington 98009-1645 Telephone: (650) 980-1990
16		Facsimile: (425) 412-7171
17		Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class
18		
19		
20		
2122		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
20		

- 3 -

PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR STATUS CONFERENCE NO. 3:15-CV-03418-EMC